arXiv:0905.4812v2 [math.SP] 19 Aug 2010

On the minimization of Dirichlet eigenvalues of the Laplace operator

M. van den Berg,[*] M. Iversen
Department of Mathematics, University of Bristol
University Walk, Bristol BS8 1TW
United Kingdom
`M.vandenBerg@bris.ac.uk`
`Mette.Iversen@bris.ac.uk`

18 August 2010

Abstract

We study the variational problem

$$\inf\{\lambda_k(\Omega) : \Omega \text{ open in } \mathbb{R}^m,\ |\Omega| < \infty,\ \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega) \le 1\},$$

where $\lambda_k(\Omega)$ is the k'th eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian acting in $L^2(\Omega)$, $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega)$ is the $(m-1)$- dimensional Hausdorff measure of the boundary of Ω, and $|\Omega|$ is the Lebesgue measure of Ω. If $m = 2$, and $k = 2, 3, \cdots$, then there exists a convex minimiser $\Omega_{2,k}$. If $m \ge 2$, and if $\Omega_{m,k}$ is a minimiser, then $\Omega^*_{m,k} := \text{int}(\overline{\Omega_{m,k}})$ is also a minimiser, and $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Omega^*_{m,k}$ is connected. Upper bounds are obtained for the number of components of $\Omega_{m,k}$. It is shown that if $m \ge 3$, and $k \le m+1$ then $\Omega_{m,k}$ has at most 4 components. Furthermore $\Omega_{m,k}$ is connected in the following cases : (i) $m \ge 2, k = 2$, (ii) $m = 3, 4, 5$, and $k = 3, 4$, (iii) $m = 4, 5$, and $k = 5$, (iv) $m = 5$ and $k = 6$. Finally, upper bounds on the number of components are obtained for minimisers for other constraints such as the Lebesgue measure and the torsional rigidity.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 49Q10; 49R50; 35P15.

Keywords: Variational problems, Dirichlet eigenvalues.

---

[*] Research supported by The Leverhulme Trust, Research Fellowship 2008/0368

1 Introduction

Let Ω be an open set in Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^m$ $(m = 2, 3, \cdots)$, with boundary $\partial\Omega$, and let $-\Delta_\Omega$ be the Dirichlet Laplacian acting in $L^2(\Omega)$. It is well known that if Ω has finite Lebesgue measure $|\Omega| = \int 1_\Omega$ then $-\Delta_\Omega$ has compact resolvent, and the spectrum of $-\Delta_\Omega$ is discrete and consists of eigenvalues $\lambda_1(\Omega) \le \lambda_2(\Omega) \le \cdots$ with $\lambda_j(\Omega) \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$. The Faber-Krahn inequality (Theorem 3.2.1 in [8]) asserts that

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) \ge \lambda_1(B_m) \left(\frac{|B_m|}{|\Omega|} \right)^{2/m}, \tag{1}$$

where $B_m = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^m : |x| < 1\}$. By scaling we see that we have equality in (1) if Ω is any ball.

The Krahn-Szegö inequality (Theorem 4.1.1 in [8]) asserts that

$$\lambda_2(\Omega) \ge 2^{2/m} \lambda_1(B_m) \left(\frac{|B_m|}{|\Omega|} \right)^{2/m}, \tag{2}$$

where we have equality if Ω is the union of two disjoint balls with equal measure. For higher Dirichlet eigenvalues $(k > 2)$ it is not known whether the variational problem

$$\inf\{\lambda_k(\Omega) : \Omega \text{ open in } \mathbb{R}^m,\ |\Omega| \le 1\} \tag{3}$$

has a minimiser. However, it has been shown that if $k = 3$, and if the collection of open sets in (3) is enlarged to the quasi-open sets then a minimiser exists [5]. Moreover it has been conjectured that the minimiser for $k = 3$ in (3) is a ball if $m = 2, 3$ or the union of three pairwise disjoint ball with measure $1/3$ each if $m > 3$. This could possibly suggest that the number of components of a minimiser of (3) increases as m and k increase. We will show in Theorem 3 and Corollary 4 that this is not the case as long as $k \le m + 1$.

The following variational problem was considered in [6].

$$\inf\{\lambda_2(\Omega) : \Omega \text{ open and bounded in } \mathbb{R}^m, \mathrm{Per}(\Omega) \le 1\}, \tag{4}$$

where the perimeter of a measurable set Ω is defined by

$$\mathrm{Per}(\Omega) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^m} |\nabla 1_\Omega|$$

in the sense of BV functions, with $\mathrm{Per}(\Omega) = +\infty$ if 1_Ω is not a BV function. There it was shown that if $m = 2$ then there exists a minimiser, which is convex, and C^∞. Moreover its boundary contains exactly two points where the curvature vanishes. It is easy to construct other minimisers of (4). Let $\Omega_{m,2}$ be a minimiser of (4), and let L be a nodal set of the second Dirichlet eigenfunction for $\Omega_{m,2}$. Then $\mathrm{Per}(\Omega_{m,2} \setminus L) = \mathrm{Per}(\Omega_{m,2})$ since $|L| = 0$. Since $\lambda_2(\Omega_{m,2})$ equals the first eigenvalue of either of the nodal domains, we have that $\lambda_2(\Omega_{m,2}) = \lambda_2(\Omega_{m,2} \setminus L)$. Hence $\Omega_{m,2} \setminus L$ is a minimiser of (4) which is not connected. If C is any closed subset of L then $\Omega_{m,2} \setminus C$ is also a minimiser. In order to avoid such pathologies properties and to be able to study topological properties such as connectedness we modify the constraints in (4), and study the following variational problem instead.

$$\inf\{\lambda_k(\Omega) : \Omega \text{ open in } \mathbb{R}^m, |\Omega| < \infty, \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega) \le 1\}. \tag{5}$$

The main results of this paper are the following.

Theorem 1.

i. *If* $m = 2$*, and* $k = 2, 3, \cdots$ *then* (5) *has a minimiser which is open, bounded and convex.*

ii. *Let* $\Omega_{m,k}$ *is a minimiser of* (5)*. (a) If* K *is a relatively closed subset of the nodal set* L *of the* k*'th Dirichlet eigenfunction for* $\Omega_{m,k}$ *with* $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(K) = 0$ *then* $\Omega_{m,k} \setminus K$ *is also a minimiser of* (5)*. (b)* $\Omega_{2,k}$ *is connected for all* $k = 1, 2, \cdots$.

iii. *Denote the infimum in* (5) *by* λ_k^**. If* $m \to \infty$ *then*

$$\lambda_2^* = \lambda_1(B_m)(\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m))^{2/(m-1)}(1 + (\log 4)m^{-1} + O(m^{-2})). \qquad (6)$$

iv. *If* $m = 2, 3, \cdots$ *then* $\Omega_{m,2}$ *is not a ball.*

Throughout the paper we denote for a set $E \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ its interior by $\mathrm{int}(E)$, its closure by $\overline{E}$, $E^* = \mathrm{int}(\overline{E})$, and for $x \in \mathbb{R}^m, R > 0$ we let $B(x; R) = x + RB_m$. In the following we give some topological properties of minimisers of (5), and of minimisers of variational problems with other constraints such as the Lebesgue measure in (3). Throughout the paper we denote by ω the number of components of a set $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^m$, and write e.g. $\omega_{m,k}$ for the number of components of a minimiser $\Omega_{m,k}$.

Theorem 2. *If* $\Omega_{m,k}$ *is a minimiser of* (5) *then we have the following.*

i. $\Omega_{m,k}^*$ *is a minimiser of* (5).

ii. $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Omega_{m,k}^*$ *is connected.*

iii. $\Omega_{m,2}$ *is connected* ($\omega_{m,2} = 1$) *for* $m = 3, 4, \cdots$.

iv. *If* $k = 3, 4, \cdots$*, and* $m = 3, 4, \cdots$*, then*

$$\omega_{m,k} \le 1 + \lfloor 2^{-(m-1)/m}((\lambda_k(B_m)/\lambda_1(B_m))^{(m-1)/2} - 1)\rfloor, \qquad (7)$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ *denotes the integer part.*

v.

$$\omega_{m,k} \le \begin{cases} 1, & m = 3, 4, 5, \quad k = 3, \cdots, m+1, \\ 2, & m = 6, \cdots, 24, \quad k = 3, \cdots, m+1, \\ 3, & m = 25, \cdots, 587, \quad k = 3, \cdots, m+1, \\ 4, & m = 588, \cdots, \quad k = 4, \cdots, m+1. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 3. *Suppose* T *is a non-negative function defined on the open sets in* $\mathbb{R}^m$ *which satisfies the following :*

(*a*) $T(\cup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{I}} \Omega) = \sum_{\Omega \in \mathcal{I}} T(\Omega)$ *if* $\mathcal{I}$ *is a disjoint family of open sets,*

(*b*) *There is* $\beta > 0$ *such that for* Ω open in $\mathbb{R}^m$ *and* $\alpha > 0$, $T(\alpha\Omega) = \alpha^\beta T(\Omega)$,

(*c*) $\inf\{\lambda_1(\Omega) : \Omega \text{ open in } \mathbb{R}^m,\ T(\Omega) \le 1\}$ *is minimised by the ball* $B \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ *with* $T(B) = 1$,

(*d*) T *is invariant under isometries of* Ω ,

(*e*) $T(\Omega) < \infty$ *implies that the spectrum of* $-\Delta_\Omega$ *is discrete.*

If $\Omega_{m,k}$ be a minimiser of

$$\inf\{\lambda_k(\Omega) : \Omega \text{ open in } \mathbb{R}^m,\ T(\Omega) \le 1\}, \tag{8}$$

and if $m = 2, 3, \cdots$ and $k = 3, 4, \cdots$ with $k > \lfloor (\lambda_k(B_m)/\lambda_1(B_m))^{\beta/2} \rfloor$, then

$$\omega_{m,k} \le \lfloor (\lambda_k(B_m)/\lambda_1(B_m))^{\beta/2} \rfloor - 1. \tag{9}$$

Two examples of set functions satisfying the assumptions on T are the Lebesgue measure with $\beta = m$, and the torsional rigidity with $\beta = m + 2$. In the Appendix in Section 4 we will show that the torsional rigidity satisfies (e). It follows directly from the definition of the torsional rigidity in (54) and (55) below that the torsional rigidity satisfies (a), (b) with $\beta = m + 2$, and (d). In [10] and [11] it was shown that (c) holds for the torsional rigidity if $m = 2$. The method of proof in these papers extends to all m [10]. The bounds on the number of components for these two examples are given in the following.

Corollary 4.

i. If $\beta = m$ then

$$\omega_{m,k} \le \begin{cases} 1,\ m = 2, 3,\ k = 3, \cdots, m+1, \\ 2,\ m = 4, \cdots, 7,\ k = 4, \cdots, m+1, \\ 3,\ m = 8, \cdots, 19,\ k = 5, \cdots, m+1, \\ 4,\ m = 20, \cdots, 60,\ k = 6, \cdots, m+1, \\ 5,\ m = 61, \cdots, 548,\ k = 7, \cdots, m+1, \\ 6,\ m = 549, \cdots,\ k = 8, \cdots, m+1. \end{cases}$$

ii. If $\beta = m + 2$ then

$$\omega_{m,k} \le \begin{cases} 4,\ m = 5, \cdots, 26,\ k = 6, \cdots, m+1, \\ 5,\ m = 27, \cdots, 430,\ k = 7, \cdots, m+1, \\ 6,\ m = 431, \cdots,\ k = 8, \cdots, m+1. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 3 does not give any information for $\beta = m + 2$ if $m = 2, 3, 4$, since there are no values of k for which $m + 1 \ge k > \lfloor (\lambda_k(B_m)/\lambda_1(B_m))^{\beta/2} \rfloor$. For $\beta > m$ and k much larger than m we do not obtain information either since by Weyl's law $\lambda_k(B_m) \asymp k^{2/m}$ and so $(\lambda_k(B_m)/\lambda_1(B_m))^{\beta/2} \asymp k^{\beta/m}$. Note also that connectedness of the minimiser for the third eigenvalue in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mathbb{R}^3$ with T Lebesgue measure is proved in [14]. Here we additionally prove connectedness of the minimiser for the fourth eigenvalue in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

At present we do not know whether there exists a minimiser of (5) for $m > 2$, $k = 2, 3, \cdots$, and if so whether such a minimiser is smooth or bounded. The proofs of Theorem 2 and of Theorem 3 do not rely on any such properties.

A key ingredient in the proof of Theorem 2 is the isoperimetric inequality. Recall (Theorem 3.46 in [2]) that for a measurable set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ with $|\Omega| < \infty$,

$$|\Omega| \le |B_m| \left(\frac{\text{Per}(\Omega)}{\text{Per}(B_m)} \right)^{m/(m-1)}.$$

This combined with $\mathrm{Per}(\Omega) \le \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega)$ and $\mathrm{Per}(B_m) = \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m)$ gives the isoperimetric inequality for the $(m-1)$ - dimensional Hausdorff measure:

$$|\Omega| \le |B_m| \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega)}{\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m)} \right)^{m/(m-1)} . \tag{10}$$

Inequality (10) is well known. (See for example [1], where it was stated for bounded regions in $\mathbb{R}^m$.) By Faber-Krahn (1) and (10) we obtain the isoperimetric inequality

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) \ge \lambda_1(B_m) \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m)}{\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega)} \right)^{2/(m-1)} . \tag{11}$$

By Krahn-Szegö (2) and (10) we have that

$$\lambda_2(\Omega) \ge 2^{2/m} \lambda_1(B_m) \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m)}{\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega)} \right)^{2/(m-1)} . \tag{12}$$

Inequality (12) is not isoperimetric since (2) and (10) are isoperimetric for non-isometric sets.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove Theorem 1. The proofs of Theorems 2 and of 3 are deferred to Section 3.

2 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1. (i) Let $m = 2$, and let (Ω_n) be a minimising sequence of (5). By Lemma 6 below we have that $\Omega_n = \cup_{i=1}^{k} A_{n,i}$, where the $A_{n,i}, i = 1, \cdots, k$ is a family of pairwise disjoint, open and connected sets. By translational and rotational invariance we may rearrange the $A_{n,i}$'s such that they remain disjoint but such that $\overline{\cup_{i=1}^{k} A_{n,i}}$ is connected. Taking the convex envelope of $\overline{\cup_{i=1}^{k} A_{n,i}}$ does not increase $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial(\overline{\cup_{i=1}^{k} A_{n,i}})$ nor does $\lambda_k(\mathrm{int}(\overline{\cup_{i=1}^{k} A_{n,i}}))$ increase. We denote the resulting sequence of convex sets again by (Ω_n). It is clear that the diameter of Ω_n is bounded by $1/2$. By translating the Ω_n's we may assume that they are contained in the closed ball with radius 1 in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Following the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [5], there exists a subsequence of (Ω_n) again denoted by (Ω_n) which converges to a convex set Ω in the Hausdorff metric. Then $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega) = \mathrm{Per}(\Omega)$ by the convexity of Ω. By the lower semicontinuity for the perimeter (Proposition 2.3.6 in [9]) we have that $\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega) \le 1$. Finally $\lambda_k(\Omega_n) \to \lambda_k(\Omega)$ by Proposition 2.4.6 in [4]. We may choose Ω open. Its diameter is bounded by $1/2$.

(ii)(a) Since $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(K) = 0$ we have that $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial(\Omega_{m,k} \backslash K)) = \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega_{m,k})$. Since K is a subset of the nodal set for the k'th eigenfunction for $\Omega_{m,k}$ we have that $\lambda_k(\Omega_{m,k} \setminus K) = \lambda_k(\Omega_{m,k})$, and $\Omega_{m,k} \setminus K$ is a minimiser too. Note that it follows by the proof under (i) that all minimisers of (5) for $m = 2$ are convex up to a set of capacity 0 or up to a subset of the nodal line with one dimensional Hausdorff measure 0.

(b) Let $\Omega_{2,k}$ be a minimiser of (5) for $m = 2$, and let $\tilde{\Omega}_{2,k}$ be its open convex envelope. Then $\tilde{\Omega}_{2,k}$ is open and connected. If $K = \tilde{\Omega}_{2,k} \backslash \Omega_{2,k}$ then $\mathcal{H}^1(K) = 0$, and K does not partition $\tilde{\Omega}_{2,k}$. Hence $\Omega_{2,k}$ is connected.

(iii) To obtain a lower bound for λ_2^* we have by definition of λ_2^* and (12) that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_2^* &= \inf\{\lambda_2(\Omega)(\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega))^{2/(m-1)} : \Omega \text{ open in } \mathbb{R}^m, |\Omega| < \infty\} \\ &\ge 2^{2/m}\lambda_1(B_m)(\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m))^{2/(m-1)}.\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

To obtain an upper bound for λ_2^* we choose for Ω the union of two disjoint open balls each with boundary measure 1/2. This gives

$$\lambda_2^* \le 2^{2/(m-1)}\lambda_1(B_m)(\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m))^{2/(m-1)}, \tag{14}$$

and (6) follows by (13) and (14).

(iv) Suppose that $k = 2$ and that B_m is a minimiser of (5). Then $\lambda_2^* = \lambda_2(B_m)(\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m))^{2/(m-1)}$. Then by (14) we have that

$$\lambda_2(B_m) \le 2^{2/(m-1)}\lambda_1(B_m). \tag{15}$$

But $\lambda_1(B_m) = j^2_{(m-2)/2}$, and $\lambda_2(B_m) = j^2_{m/2}$, where j_ν is the first positive zero of the Bessel function $J_\nu, \nu \ge 0$. Hence (15) implies

$$j_{m/2} \le 2^{1/(m-1)} j_{(m-2)/2}. \tag{16}$$

However, (16) contradicts the numerical values of $j_{(m-2)/2}$ and of $j_{m/2}$ for $3 \le m < 2^{15}$ of [13]. For $m \ge 2^{15}$ (16) contradicts the lower bound for $j_{m/2}$ and the upper bound for $j_{(m-2)/2}$ as obtained from (40). Hence $\Omega_{m,2}$ is not a ball for $m = 3, 4, \cdots$.

To show that B_2 is not a minimiser for (5) with $k = m = 2$ we consider the ellipse

$$\Omega_t = \{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x_1^2 + (1+t)^{-2}x_2^2 < 1\},\ t > 0. \tag{17}$$

An elementary calculation shows that for $t \to 0$

$$\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega_t) = 4\int_0^1 dx(1-x^2)^{-1/2}(1+2tx^2+t^2x^2)^{1/2} = 2\pi(1+t/2) + o(t). \tag{18}$$

Let ϕ_t denote the Dirichlet eigenfunction corresponding to $\lambda_2(\Omega_t)$. The nodal line of ϕ_t is the set $\Omega_t \cap \{x_2 = 0\}$. Denote $\Omega_{t,+} = \Omega_t \cap \{x_2 > 0\}$. Then $\lambda_2(\Omega_t) = \lambda_1(\Omega_{t,+})$. Define for $(x_1, x_2) \in \Omega_{t,+}$

$$\psi_t(x_1, x_2) = \phi_0(x_1, (1+t)^{-1}x_2), \tag{19}$$

where $\phi_0 = \lim_{t\to 0^+}\phi_t$, and restricted to $\Omega_{0,+}$, is the first Dirichlet eigenfunction corresponding to $\lambda_1(\Omega_{0,+}$. Then

$$\int_{\Omega_{t,+}} \psi_t^2 = (1+t)\int_{\Omega_{0,+}} \phi_0^2, \tag{20}$$

and

$$\int_{\Omega_{t,+}} |\nabla\psi_t|^2 = (1+t)\int_{\Omega_{0,+}} \left(\left(\frac{\partial\phi_0}{\partial x_1}\right)^2 + (1+t)^{-1}\left(\frac{\partial\phi_0}{\partial x_2}\right)^2\right). \tag{21}$$

Since

$$\lambda(\Omega_{t,+}) \le \frac{\int_{\Omega_{t,+}} |\nabla\psi_t|^2}{\int_{\Omega_{t,+}} \psi_t^2}\ ,$$

we have by (20) and (21) that for $t \to 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_2(\Omega_t) &\le \lambda_2(\Omega_0) - 2t\frac{\int_{\Omega_{0,+}}\left(\frac{\partial\phi_0}{\partial x_2}\right)^2}{\int_{\Omega_{0,+}}\phi_0^2} + o(t)\\ &= \lambda_2(\Omega_0)\left(1 - 2t\int_{\Omega_{0,+}}\left(\frac{\partial\phi_0}{\partial x_2}\right)^2\left(\int_{\Omega_{0,+}}|\nabla\phi_0|^2\right)^{-1}\right) + o(t). \qquad (22)\end{aligned}$$

Since ϕ_0 is given in polar coordinates by

$$\phi_0(r,\theta) = J_1(j_1 r)\sin\theta,\ 0 < \theta < \pi,\ 0 < r < 1. \qquad (23)$$

we use (23), $\int_0^\pi(\cos\theta)^4 d\theta = \int_0^\pi(\sin\theta)^4 d\theta = 3\int_0^\pi(\cos\theta)^2(\sin\theta)^2 d\theta$, and $\int_0^1 J_1'(j_1 r)J_1(j_1 r)dr = 0$ to verify that

$$\int_{\Omega_{0,+}}\left(\frac{\partial\phi_0}{\partial x_2}\right)^2 = \frac{3}{4}\int_{\Omega_{0,+}}|\nabla\phi_0|^2. \qquad (24)$$

Combining (18), (22), and (24) we conclude that for $t \to 0$

$$(\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega_t))^2\lambda_2(\Omega_t) \le (\mathcal{H}^1(\partial\Omega_0))^2\lambda_2(\Omega_0)(1 - t/2) + o(t) < \lambda_2^*.$$

Hence $\Omega_0 = B_2$ is not a minimiser. $\square$

3 Proofs of Theorems 2 and 3

3.1 Proof of Theorem 2

To prove Theorem 2(i) suppose that $\Omega_{m,k}$ is a minimiser of (5). Then $\Omega^*_{m,k}$ is open and $\partial\Omega^*_{m,k} = \overline{\Omega^*_{m,k}} \setminus \Omega^*_{m,k} \subset \overline{\Omega_{m,k}} \setminus \mathrm{int}(\Omega_{m,k}) = \partial\Omega_{m,k}$, and hence $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega^*_{m,k}) \le 1$. Also note that $\Omega^*_{m,k}\setminus\Omega_{m,k} \subset \partial\Omega_{m,k}$ and so $|\Omega^*_{m,k}\setminus\Omega_{m,k}| = 0$. Thus $|\Omega^*_{m,k}| \le |\Omega_{m,k}| < \infty$. Finally $\Omega_{m,k} \subset \Omega^*_{m,k}$, which implies $\lambda_k(\Omega^*_{m,k}) \le \lambda_k(\Omega_{m,k})$. Therefore $\Omega^*_{m,k}$ is a minimiser of (5).

To prove Theorem 2(ii) we note that $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Omega^*_{m,k}$ is closed and hence its components are closed. Suppose that C is a component of $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Omega^*_{m,k}$ with $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial C) > 0$ and $|C| < \infty$. This gives $|\Omega^*_{m,k} \cup C| \le |\Omega^*_{m,k}| + |C| < \infty$ (a). By monotonicity of Dirichlet eigenvalues $\lambda_k(\Omega^*_{m,k} \cup C) \le \lambda_k(\Omega^*_{m,k})$ (b). Also $\partial C \subset \partial\Omega^*_{m,k}$, and hence $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial(\Omega^*_{m,k} \cup C)) = \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega^*_{m,k}) - \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial C) < \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega^*_{m,k})$(c). Finally to show that $\Omega^*_{m,k} \cup C$ is open it suffices to show that any $x \in \partial C$ is an interior point. Suppose to the contrary that for all $\epsilon > 0$, $B(x;\epsilon) \setminus (\Omega^*_{m,k} \cup C) \ne \emptyset$. Then x is a limit point of another closed component of $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Omega^*_{m,k}$, and so belongs both to that component and C. This contradicts the maximality of C. Hence $\Omega^*_{m,k} \cup C$ is open (d). Then (a)-(d) contradict that $\Omega^*_{m,k}$ is a minimiser of (5). Finally suppose C is a component of $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Omega^*_{m,k}$ with $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial C) = 0$. Then as above $C \subset \mathrm{int}(\Omega^*_{m,k} \cup C)$, which combined with $C = \partial C \subset \partial\Omega^*_{m,k}$ implies the contradiction $C \subset \Omega^*_{m,k}$. We conclude that all components of $R^m\setminus\Omega^*_{m,k}$ have infinite Lebesgue measure. Since $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega^*) \le 1$, $\Omega^*_{m,k}$ cannot separate infinite components, and so $\mathbb{R}^m \setminus \Omega^*_{m,k}$ is connected.

In Lemmas 5-7 we obtain various properties of the minimisers of (5). We say that a component G of a minimiser $\Omega_{m,k}$ of (5) supports l eigenvalues if $\#\{\lambda_i(G) \le \lambda_k^*\} = l$. In Lemma 8 we obtain an upper bound for the second Dirichlet eigenvalue of two balls with radius R which overlap by an amount ϵ. This, together with Lemma 7, is then used to conclude that a minimiser of (5) has at most one component supporting only one eigenvalue. The proof of Theorem 2 is completed subsequently.

Lemma 5. *Let $\Omega_{m,k}$ be a minimiser of* (5) *and let*

$$\Omega_{m,k} = \cup_{i\in I} G_i, \tag{25}$$

where the $G_i, i \in I$ are pairwise disjoint, open, non-empty, and connected, and I is either finite or countably infinite. Then for all $i, j \in I$, $i \ne j$, we have $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial G_i \cap \partial G_j) = 0$, and

$$\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial \Omega_{m,k}) = \sum_{i\in I} \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial G_i).$$

Proof. Suppose there exists $i, j \in I$, $i \ne j$, such that $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial G_i \cap \partial G_j) > 0$. Then

$$\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial(\text{int}(\Omega_{m,k} \cup (\partial G_i \cap \partial G_j)))) < \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial \Omega_{m,k}), \tag{26}$$

and, in obvious notation,

$$\text{spec}(-\Delta_{\text{int}(\Omega_{m,k}\cup(\partial G_i \cap \partial G_j))}) \le \text{spec}(-\Delta_{\Omega_{m,k}}).$$

In particular $\lambda_k(\text{int}(\Omega_{m,k} \cup (\partial G_i \cap \partial G_j))) \le \lambda_k(\Omega_{m,k})$ which together with (26) contradicts that $\Omega_{m,k}$ is a minimiser. Hence $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial G_i \cap \partial G_j) = 0$. □

Lemma 6. *If $\Omega_{m,k}$ is a minimiser of* (5) *then*

$$\Omega_{m,k} = \cup_{i=1}^{\omega_{m,k}} G_i,$$

for some $\omega_{m,k} \in \{1, 2, \cdots, k\}$, where the G_i's are pairwise disjoint, open, non-empty and connected.

Proof. Since the G_i's are pairwise disjoint,

$$\text{spec}(-\Delta_{\Omega_{m,k}}) = \oplus_{i\in I} \text{spec}(-\Delta_{G_i}). \tag{27}$$

We relabel the G_i's such that $\lambda_1(G_1) \le \lambda_1(G_2) \le \cdots$. Suppose that $\#I \ge k+1$. Then (27) implies that $\lambda_i(\Omega_{m,k}) \le \lambda_1(G_i)$, $i = 1, \cdots, k$, and $\lambda_k(\Omega_{m,k}) \le \lambda_k(\cup_{i=1}^k G_i)$. Then $\cup_{i=1}^k G_i$ is a minimiser. By Lemma 5, $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial(\cup_{i=1}^k G_i)) < \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial \Omega_{m,k})$ since $G_{k+1} \ne \emptyset$. Contradiction. Hence $\#I \le k$. □

Lemma 7. *Label the eigenvalues of $-\Delta_{G_i}$ which are not greater than λ_k^* by $\lambda_1(G_i), \cdots, \lambda_j(G_i)$. Then $\lambda_j(G_i) = \lambda_k^*$, and G_i is a minimiser of* (5) *(under the appropriate scaling) with $k = j$.*

Proof. Suppose $\lambda_j(G_i) < \lambda_k(\Omega_{m,k})$. Then without effecting the value of $\lambda_k(\Omega_{m,k})$ we could scale down G_i until we get $\lambda_j(G_i) = \lambda_k(\Omega_{m,k})$ resulting in a decrease in the measure of the boundary which would contradict that $\Omega_{m,k}$ is a minimiser of (5). Hence $\lambda_j(G_i) = \lambda_k(\Omega_{m,k}) = \lambda_k^*$.

Suppose finally that G_i is not a minimiser of (5) with $k = j$. Let A be a minimiser of (5) scaled such that $\lambda_j(A) = \lambda_j(G_i)$ and hence $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial A) < \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial G_i)$. Thus we have $\lambda_k(\Omega_{m,k}) = \lambda_k((\Omega_{m,k}\backslash G_i)\cup A)$ and $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial((\Omega_{m,k}\backslash G_i)\cup A)) < \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega_{m,k})$. Contradiction, since $\Omega_{m,k}$ is a minimiser of (5). □

Lemma 8. *Let $B(\epsilon) = B(0;R) \cap \{x : x_1 < R - \epsilon\}$, and let*

$$\Omega(\epsilon) = \cup_{j=0}^{1} B(2(R-\epsilon)je_1; R). \tag{28}$$

Then

$$\lambda_2(\Omega(\epsilon)) \le \lambda_1(B(\epsilon)) \le \lambda_1(B(0;R)) + O(\epsilon^{m/2}),\ \epsilon \to 0. \tag{29}$$

Proof. The first inequality in (29) follows by Dirichlet bracketing if we impose Dirichlet boundary conditions on $\Omega(\epsilon) \cap \{x_1 = R - \epsilon\}$. To prove the second inequality in (29) we denote the first Dirichlet eigenfunction on $B(0;R)$ by ϕ, and let χ be a C^∞ function on $\mathbb{R}^m$ depending on x_1 only, which is decreasing in x_1 on $[R-2\epsilon, R-\epsilon]$, with $|\nabla\chi(x)| \le 2/\epsilon$, $\chi(x) = -1$ for $x_1 \ge R - \epsilon$, and $\chi(x) = 0$ for $x_1 \le R-2\epsilon$. Let $\psi = \phi(1+\chi)$. We will use the variational principle with test function ψ to obtain an upper bound on $\lambda_1(B(\epsilon))$. Recall that since $\partial B(0;R)$ is smooth there exists C depending on m such that $\phi(x) \le C(R-|x|)$, and $|\nabla\phi(x)| \le C$. Firstly

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B(\epsilon)} |\nabla\psi|^2 = \int_{B(\epsilon)} \left(|\nabla\phi|^2(1+\chi)^2 + \phi^2|\nabla\chi|^2 + 2\phi(1+\chi)\nabla\phi.\nabla\chi\right) \qquad (30)\\
&\le \int_{B(\epsilon)} |\nabla\phi|^2 + C^2\int_{B(\epsilon)-B(2\epsilon)} \left((R-|x|)^2|\nabla\chi|^2 + 2C^2(R-|x|)|\nabla\chi|\right)\\
&\le \int_{B(0)} |\nabla\phi|^2 + 24C^2|B(0) - B(2\epsilon)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Secondly

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{B(\epsilon)} \phi^2(1+\chi)^2 &= \int_{B(0)} \phi^2(1+\chi)^2 \ge \int_{B(0)} \left(\phi^2 + 2\phi^2\chi\right) \qquad (31)\\
&\ge \int_{B(0)} \left(\phi^2 + 2C^2\chi\right) \ge \int_{B(0)} \phi^2 - 2C^2|B(0) - B(2\epsilon)|.
\end{aligned}$$

We conclude by (30) and (31) that for $\epsilon \to 0$

$$\lambda_1(B(\epsilon)) \le \lambda_1(B(0;R)) + O(|B(0;R) - B(2\epsilon)|) = \lambda_1(B(0;R)) + O(\epsilon^{m/2}).$$

□

Lemma 9. *Let $m = 3, 4, \cdots$, and let $k = 2, 3, 4, \cdots$. If $\Omega_{m,k}$ is a minimiser of* (5) *then $\Omega_{m,k}$ has at most one component supporting only one eigenvalue.*

Proof. Suppose $\Omega_{m,k}$ has at least 2 components say G_1 and G_2 supporting only one eigenvalue each. By Lemma 7 each of these components is a minimiser for the first eigenvalue, and $\lambda_1(G_1) = \lambda_1(G_2) = \lambda_k^*$. Hence by (11) these components are balls with equal radius say R. Let

$$\Omega(\epsilon) = \cup_{j=0}^{1} B(2(R-\epsilon)je_1; R),$$

where $e_1 = (1, 0, \cdots, 0)$. An elementary calculation shows that for $\epsilon \to 0$

$$\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega(\epsilon)) = \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial\Omega(0)) - 2\Gamma((m+1)/2)^{-1}(2\pi R\epsilon)^{(m-1)/2}(1 + o(1)).$$

Let $L(\epsilon) > 0$ be such that

$$\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial(L(\epsilon)\Omega(\epsilon))) = \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial(\Omega(0))).$$

Then

$$L(\epsilon) = 1 + C\epsilon^{(m-1)/2}(1 + o(1)), \tag{32}$$

as $\epsilon \to 0$ for some $C > 0$ depending on R and m only. By scaling, Lemma 8 and (32)

$$\lambda_2(L(\epsilon)\Omega(\epsilon)) = L(\epsilon)^{-2}\lambda_2(\Omega(\epsilon)) = \lambda_2(\Omega(0)) - C'\epsilon^{(m-1)/2}(1 + o(1)),$$

for some $C' > 0$ depending on R and m only. Hence for ϵ sufficiently small $L(\epsilon)\Omega(\epsilon)$ is connected with $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial(L(\epsilon)\Omega(\epsilon))) = \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial G_1) + \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial G_2)$, and $\lambda_2(L(\epsilon)\Omega(\epsilon)) < \lambda_2(G_1 \cup G_2)$. This contradicts the hypothesis that $\Omega_{m,k}$ has two components G_1 and G_2, whose union supports two eigenvalues. □

In the sequel we suppress the m- and k- dependence of $\omega_{m,k}$ and write $\omega_{m,k} = \omega$.

To prove Theorem 2(iii) we note that by Lemma 6, $\Omega_{m,2}$ is either connected or is the union of two components supporting one eigenvalue each. The latter is excluded by Lemma 9. So $\Omega_{m,2}$ is connected.

To prove Theorem 2(iv) we let $k = 3, 4, \cdots$, and $m = 3, 4, \cdots$. By Lemma 9 we may assume that $\Omega_{m,k}$ has at most one component supporting only one eigenvalue of $\Omega_{m,k}$. So

$$\Omega_{m,k} = \cup_{i=1}^{\omega} G_i,$$

where all components except possibly G_1 support at least two eigenvalues. Let $\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial G_1) = a$. By Lemma 7 and Faber-Krahn we have that

$$\lambda_k^* \geq \lambda_1(G_1) \geq \lambda_1(B_m)\left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m)}{a}\right)^{2/(m-1)}.$$

By Lemma 7 we also have that for any $i \in \{2, 3, \cdots, \omega\}$

$$\lambda_k^* = \max\{\lambda_j(G_i) : \lambda_j(G_i) \leq \lambda_k^*\}.$$

By Krahn-Szegö it follows that for any $i \in \{2, 3, \cdots, \omega\}$

$$\lambda_k^* \geq 2^{2/m}\lambda_1(B_m)\left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m)}{\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial G_i)}\right)^{2/(m-1)}, \tag{33}$$

and in particular that

$$\lambda_k^* \geq 2^{2/m}\lambda_1(B_m)\left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m)}{\min_{i\in\{2,\cdots,\omega\}} \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial G_i)}\right)^{2/(m-1)}. \tag{34}$$

We have by Lemma 5 that

$$\sum_{i=2}^{\omega} \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial G_i) = 1 - a,$$

and thus

$$\min_{i\in\{2,\cdots,\omega\}} \mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial G_i) \le \frac{1-a}{\omega - 1}.$$

Hence by (34)

$$\lambda_k^* \ge 2^{2/m}\lambda_1(B_m)(\omega-1)^{2/(m-1)} \left(\frac{\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m)}{1-a}\right)^{2/(m-1)}. \tag{35}$$

Combining (33) with (35) yields

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_k^* &\ge \lambda_1(B_m)(\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m))^{2/(m-1)} \\ &\quad \times \max\{a^{-2/(m-1)}, 2^{2/m}(\omega-1)^{2/(m-1)}(1-a)^{-2/(m-1)}\}.\end{aligned}$$

The right hand side of the inequality above attains its lower bound for

$$a = (1 + (\omega-1)2^{(m-1)/m})^{-1}.$$

Hence

$$\lambda_k^* \ge \lambda_1(B_m)(\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m))^{2/(m-1)}(1 + (\omega-1)2^{(m-1)/m})^{2/(m-1)}. \tag{36}$$

On the other hand

$$\lambda_k^* \le \lambda_k(B_m)(\mathcal{H}^{m-1}(\partial B_m))^{2/(m-1)}. \tag{37}$$

Putting (36) and (37) together gives that

$$\lambda_k(B_m) \ge \lambda_1(B_m)(1 + (\omega-1)2^{(m-1)/m})^{2/(m-1)}.$$

This completes the upper bound in (7).

To prove Theorem 2(v) we note that

$$\lambda_2(B_m) = \cdots = \lambda_{m+1}(B_m). \tag{38}$$

Hence for $k \le m+1$ we have that

$$\omega \le 1 + \lfloor 2^{-(m-1)/m}(\lambda_2(B_m)/\lambda_1(B_m))^{(m-1)/2} - 1)\rfloor. \tag{39}$$

Recall that $\lambda_1(B_m) = j^2_{(m-2)/2}$, and $\lambda_2(B_m) = j^2_{m/2}$. Numerical evaluation of the right hand side of (39) for $3 \le m < 2^{15}$ using [13] gives the upper bound for ω as advertised. To prove the Corollary for $m \ge 2^{15}$ we use that [12]

$$j_\nu = \nu + a\nu^{1/3} + a_\nu\ \nu^{-1/3},\ 1 \le \nu < \infty, \tag{40}$$

where $a = 1.8557\cdots$ can be expressed in terms of the first positive zero of an Airy function, and $0.500 < a_\nu < 1.537$. Hence

$$j_{m/2} \le m/2 + a(m/2)^{1/3} + 2(m/2)^{-1/3}, \tag{41}$$

and

$$j_{(m-2)/2} \geq (m-2)/2 + a((m-2)/2)^{1/3}. \tag{42}$$

Combining (41) and (42) gives that for $m \geq 2^{15}$

$$\left(\frac{j_{m/2}}{j_{(m-2)/2}}\right)^2 \leq e^{2+6m^{-1/3}} \leq e^{35/16}. \tag{43}$$

So for $m \geq 2^{15}$ and $k \leq m+1$

$$\omega \leq 1 + \lfloor 2^{-1+2^{-15}}(e^{35/16}-1)\rfloor = 4,$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 2.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 3

To prove Theorem 3 note that the following holds under the assumptions on T.

Lemma 10. *Let Ω be an open set in $\mathbb{R}^m$ such that $T(\Omega) < \infty$. Then*

$$\lambda_1(\Omega) \geq \lambda_1(B_m)\left(\frac{T(B_m)}{T(\Omega)}\right)^{2/\beta}, \tag{44}$$

and

$$\lambda_2(\Omega) \geq 2^{2/\beta}\lambda_1(B_m)\left(\frac{T(B_m)}{T(\Omega)}\right)^{2/\beta}. \tag{45}$$

Proof. The proof of (44) follows directly from hypotheses (b) and (c) in Theorem 3. To prove (45) we let ϕ_2 be the second eigenfunction of the Dirichlet Laplacian on Ω, and let $\Omega^+ = \{x \in \Omega : \phi(x) > 0\}$ and $\Omega^- = \{x \in \Omega : \phi(x) < 0\}$. Then $\lambda_2(\Omega) = \lambda_1(\Omega^+) = \lambda_1(\Omega^-)$. By (44) applied to both Ω^+ and Ω^- respectively we obtain that

$$\lambda_2(\Omega) \geq \lambda_1(B_m)T(B_m)^{2/\beta}\max\{T(\Omega^+)^{-2/\beta}, T(\Omega^-)^{-2/\beta}\},$$

and (45) follows since $T(\Omega^+) + T(\Omega^-) = T(\Omega)$. □

Note that equality in (45) implies that Ω is the union of two disjoint balls with the same radius.

Proof of Theorem 3. If $\Omega_{m,k}$ is a minimiser of (8) then it is of the form

$$\Omega_{m,k} = \cup_{i=1}^{\omega} G_i,$$

where the G_i's are as in 6. Define

$$\mu_k^* = \lambda_k(\Omega_{m,k}), \tag{46}$$

and label the eigenvalues of G_i which are not strictly larger than μ_k^* by $\lambda_1(G_i), \cdots, \lambda_j(G_i)$. Then similar to the proof of Lemma 7,

$$\lambda_j(G_i) = \mu_k^*, \tag{47}$$

and G_i is a minimiser of (8) under appropriate scaling with $k = j$.

Let $\omega = k_1 + k_2$, where $G_1, \cdots, G_{k_1}$ support one eigenvalue each, and each of $G_{k_1+1}, \cdots, G_{k_1+k_2}$ supports at least two eigenvalues. If $\omega = k$, then $\Omega_{m,k}$ is the union of k pairwise disjoint identical balls and $\mu_k^* = \lambda_1(B)k^{2/\beta}$. Combining this with

$$\mu_k^* \le \lambda_k(B), \tag{48}$$

gives

$$k \le (\lambda_k(B)/\lambda_1(B))^{\beta/2}.$$

Hence if $k > \lfloor (j_{m/2}/j_{(m-2)/2})^\beta \rfloor$ then $k_2 \ge 1$.

By hypothesis (c), (46) and (47) each of the components $G_1, \cdots, G_{k_1}$ are balls with $T(G_1) = \cdots = T(G_{k_1}) =: a$. So

$$\mu_k^* = \lambda_1(G_1) = \cdots = \lambda_1(G_{k_1}) = \lambda_1(B)a^{-2/\beta}. \tag{49}$$

Let G_i be one of the remaining k_2 components supporting at least two eigenvalues with (47). Then by Lemma 10

$$\mu_k^* = \lambda_j(G_i) \ge \lambda_2(G_i) \ge \lambda_1(B)T(G_i)^{-2/\beta}2^{2/\beta}. \tag{50}$$

But

$$\min_{i\in\{k_1+1,\cdots,k_1+k_2\}} T(G_i) \le k_2^{-1}\Sigma_{i=k_1+1}^{k_1+k_2}T(G_i) = k_2^{-1}(1-k_1a). \tag{51}$$

Combining (49), (50) and (51) we obtain that

$$\mu_k^* \ge \lambda_1(B)\max\left\{a^{-2/\beta}, (2k_2(1-k_1a)^{-1})^{2/\beta}\right\}. \tag{52}$$

But the right hand side of (52) attains its minimum for $a = (k_1+2k_2)^{-1}$. Hence by (52)

$$\mu_k^* \ge \lambda_1(B)(k_1+2k_2)^{2/\beta} \ge \lambda_1(B)(\omega+1)^{2/\beta}. \tag{53}$$

Combining (53) with (48) implies (9). □

The proof of Corollary 4 is similarly to the proof of Theorem 2 (v).

Since the minimiser of (8) for $k = 2$ is the union of two identical disjoint balls it follows that each of the G_i's support either one eigenvalue or at least three eigenvalues. Thus $k \ge k_1 + 3k_2$. This can give additional information as is illustrated by the following.

Consider the minimiser for (8) with $k = 4$, $m = 4, \cdots, 7$ and T Lebesgue measure. By Theorem 3 it has at most two components, and as no component supports two eigenvalues the minimiser is either connected or is the union of a ball supporting one eigenvalue with a component supporting three eigenvalues. Likewise the minimiser for $k = 5$ and $m = 4, \cdots, 7$ is by Theorem 3 either connected, or is the union of a ball supporting one eigenvalue with a component supporting four eigenvalues. For the fifth eigenvalue in $\mathbb{R}^m$, $m = 8, \cdots, 19$, we may have up to three components, whereby there is the extra possible configuration of two components each supporting one eigenvalue and a third component supporting three.

4 Appendix

Let $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the unique weak solution of

$$-\Delta_\Omega u = 1 \tag{54}$$

with $u = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$. The torsional rigidity of Ω is defined by

$$P(\Omega) = \int_\Omega u. \tag{55}$$

P is well defined since $u \geq 0$. It is well known that $P(\Omega)$ may be finite even if $|\Omega| = +\infty$. For example if Ω is any open set in $\mathbb{R}^m$ for which $-\Delta_\Omega \geq c_\Omega \delta^{-2}$ in the sense of quadratic forms, and $\delta \in L^2(\Omega)$, where δ is the distance to the boundary then $(2m)^{-1}\int_\Omega \delta^2 \leq P(\Omega) \leq c_\Omega^{-1}\int_\Omega \delta^2$ [3].

Below we show that finite torsional rigidity implies discrete spectrum of the Dirichlet Laplacian. In particular we obtain a lower bound for $\lambda_k(\Omega)$ in terms of k and $P(\Omega)$. This lower bound does not have Weyl asymptotics for the reason explained above.

Lemma 11. *If $P(\Omega) < \infty$ then the spectrum of $-\Delta_\Omega$ is discrete, and*

$$\lambda_k(\Omega) \geq c(m)P(\Omega)^{-2/(m+2)}k^{2/(m+2)}, \tag{56}$$

where

$$c(m) = (m+2)^{-1}(4\pi)^{m/(m+2)}(2\Gamma((2+m)/2)))^{2/(m+2)}. \tag{57}$$

Proof. Let $p_\Omega(x, y; t), x \in \Omega, y \in \Omega, t > 0$ denote the Dirichlet heat kernel for Ω. It is well known that the Dirichlet heat kernel is non-negative, monotone increasing in Ω, and that it satisfies the semigroup property. Moreover

$$u(x) = \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega dt\ dy\ p_\Omega(x, y; t).$$

Let $0 < \alpha < 1$. By Tonelli's Theorem

$$\begin{aligned} P(\Omega) &= \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \int_\Omega dt\ dx\ dy\ p_\Omega(x, y; t) \\ &= (1-\alpha)\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \int_\Omega dt\ dx\ dy\ p_\Omega(x, y; (1-\alpha)t). \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

On the other hand by domain monotonicity

$$p_\Omega(x, y; \alpha t) \leq p_{\mathbb{R}^m}(x, y; \alpha t) \leq (4\pi\alpha t)^{-m/2}. \tag{59}$$

By (58), (59) and the semigroup property

$$\begin{aligned} P(\Omega) &\geq (1-\alpha)\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega \int_\Omega dt(4\pi\alpha t)^{m/2}\ dx\ dy\ p_\Omega(x, y; (1-\alpha)t)p_\Omega(x, y; \alpha t) \\ &= (1-\alpha)\int_0^\infty dt(4\pi\alpha t)^{m/2}\int_\Omega dx\ p_\Omega(x, x; t). \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Hence the heat semigroup is trace class, and

$$\int_\Omega dx\ p_\Omega(x, x; t) = \Sigma_{j=1}^\infty e^{-t\lambda_j(\Omega)} < \infty,\ t > 0. \tag{61}$$

By (60) and (61)

$$\begin{aligned} P(\Omega) &\geq (1-\alpha)(4\pi\alpha)^{m/2}\Gamma((2+m)/2)\Sigma_{j=1}^{\infty}\lambda_j^{-(2+m)/2} \\ &\geq (1-\alpha)(4\pi\alpha)^{m/2}\Gamma((2+m)/2)k\lambda_k^{-(2+m)/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

Choosing $\alpha = m/(m+2)$ in (62) gives (56) with (57). □

Acknowledgments We wish to thank Giuseppe Buttazzo and Thomas Hoffmann-Ostenhof for helpful discussions.

References

[1] F. Almgren, *Optimal isoperimetric inequalities*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 13, 123-126 (1985).

[2] L. Ambrosio, N. Fusco, D. Pallara, *Functions of Bounded Variation and Free Discontinuity Problems*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, Clarendon Press, Oxford (2000).

[3] M. van den Berg, P. B. Gilkey, *Heat content and a Hardy inequality for complete Riemannian manifolds*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. 36, 577-586 (2004).

[4] D. Bucur, G. Buttazzo, *Variational methods in shape optimization problems*, Progress in nonlinear differential equations and their applications, Birkhäuser Verlag, Boston (2005).

[5] D. Bucur, A. Henrot, *Minimization of the third eigenvalue of the Dirichlet Laplacian*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London 456, 985-996 (2000).

[6] D. Bucur, G. Buttazzo, A. Henrot, *Minimization of $\lambda_2(\Omega)$ with a Perimeter Constraint*, Indiana University Mathematics Journal 58, 2709-2728 (2009).

[7] I. Chavel, *Isoperimetric Inequalities: Differential Geometric and Analytic perspectives*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2001).

[8] A. Henrot, *Extremum Problems for Eigenvalues of Elliptic Operators*, Frontiers in Mathematics, Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel (2006).

[9] A. Henrot, M. Pierre, *Variation et optimisation de formes: Une analyse géométrique*, Mathématiques et Applications 48, Springer, Berlin (2005).

[10] M.-T. Kohler-Jobin, *Démonstration de l'inégalité isopérimétrique $P\lambda^2 \geq \pi j_0^4/2$, conjecture par Pólya et Szegö*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sr. A-B 281, A119-A121 (1975).

[11] M.-T. Kohler-Jobin, *Une méthode de comparaison isopérimétrique de fonctionnelles de domaines de la physique mathématique. I. Une démonstration de la conjecture isopérimétrique $P\lambda^2 \geq \pi j_0^4/2$ de Pólya et Szegö*, Z. Angew.Math. Phys. 29, 757-766 (1978).

[12] L. Lorch, R. Uberti, *"Best possible" upper bounds for the first positive zeros of Bessel functions- the finite part*, J. of Computational and Applied Mathematics 75, 249-258 (1996).

[13] Maple 12, Maplesoft, Waterloo, Ontario (2008).

[14] J. B. Keller, S. A. Wolf, *Range of the First Two Eigenvalues of the Laplacian*, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A 447, 397-412 (1994).